UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/572,880	03/22/2006	Alvin S. Blum	B 100419	3658
Alvin S Blum	7590 02/20/200	EXAMINER		
2350 Del Mar F			FLETCHER, JERRY-DARYL	
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3715	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/20/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/572,880	BLUM, ALVIN S.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	JERRY-DARYL FLETCHER	3715				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	Lely filed the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 Ma	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro					
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examinet 10) The drawing(s) filed on 22 March 2006 is/are: a Applicant may not request that any objection to the or	vn from consideration. r election requirement. r. a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objected to	·				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 03/22/2006.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ite				



Application No.

Application/Control Number: 10/572,880 Page 2

Art Unit: 3715

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 10 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. In the instant case, dependent claims 10 and 13 add the limitation that the indicator is internally contained in the spherical globe, however, the independent claims 7 and 11 recite that the indicator is located on the surface of the spherical globe. In the specification the applicant discloses different embodiments of the invention wherein the indicator is either on the globe, or contained inside the globe, but fails to disclose an embodiment where the indicator is both inside and outside of the spherical globe simultaneously. Due to applicant's lack of support in the disclosure for the embodiments claimed in claims 10 and 13, the claims are held rejected for a lack enabled support in the specification.

Double Patenting

3. A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain <u>a</u> patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to

identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer <u>cannot</u> overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

- 4. Claims 1-2, 5-9 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-2 and 5-10 of prior U.S. Patent No. US 6,860,739 to Blum (Blum '739). This is a double patenting rejection.
- 5. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

6. Claims 1-2, 7 and 11 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-3 of U.S. Patent No. US 6,773,262 to Blum (Blum '262) in view of Japanese reference JP 2002-182555 to

Application/Control Number: 10/572,880

Art Unit: 3715

Ishigooka (Ishigooka). In the instant case, the claims 1-2, 7 and 11 of the current application set forth the same invention as claimed in claims 1-3 of Blum '262, except the current application specifically claims "control means operatively connecting the memory to the signals from the sensors, and for selecting from the memory, the detailed map information representing the area at the indicator", and Blum '262 does not, rather just teaching that "the memory is operatively connected to the signals from the sensors". Ishigooka teaches the use of control means the operatively connect sensors and memory in a mapping device to select map information to be displayed (par. 0013-0017). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of Blum '262 and Ishigooka, to have provided the invention of Blum '262 with the ability to controllably select and display a map portion.

Page 4

7. Claims 3-4, 10 and 12-13 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-3 of U.S. Patent Blum '262 in view of Ishigooka and US Patent No. US 4,897,038 to Fröhlich et al. (Fröhlich). In the instant case the claims 3-4, 10 and 12-13 differ from the modified invention of Blum '262 and Ishigooka in that the sensors and the indicator of the modified invention are on the outside of the spherical globe, and the applicant claims the sensors and the indicator to be on the inside of the spherical globe, with a light emitting element functioning as the indicator. Fröhlich teaches the use of a light emitting element that is located inside a mapping device as an indicator (col. 5, II. 6-8, & Figure

Application/Control Number: 10/572,880 Page 5

Art Unit: 3715

13), and further teaches that sensors are also contained within the device (col. 6, II. 32-

49). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the

invention, to have combined the teachings of Fröhlich with those of Blum '262 and

Ishigooka in order to provide the modified invention with the ability to select different

areas with blocking any of the globe features.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- a. US Patent No: US 4,790,756 to Caldwell teaches a globe with an internal light source that is used for indicating areas of the globe.
- 9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JERRY-DARYL FLETCHER whose telephone number is (571)270-5054. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 9:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Xuan M. Thai can be reached on (571) 272-7147. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/572,880 Page 6

Art Unit: 3715

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Kathleen Mosser/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3715

/J.D. F./ Examiner, Art Unit 3715